UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTICANCER, INC.,

Plaintiff,

V.

MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULING
ORDER DEADLINE AND TO AMEND
TECO DIAGNOSTICS, et al.,

Defendants.

Defendants.

Case No. 07cv2294-L (BLM)

MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULING
ORDER DEADLINE AND TO AMEND
ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT

Defendants.

[Doc. No. 28]

On May 21, 2008, Defendants filed a Combined Motion to Modify Scheduling Order Deadlines and to Amend Answer to Second Amended Complaint. Doc. No. 28. A hearing date of June 23, 2008 at 10:30 a.m. was assigned, but the Court took the motion under submission pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7.1(d)(1). See Doc. No. 29.

On June 9, 2008, Plaintiff filed a statement of non-opposition to Defendants' motion to amend. Doc. No. 30.

In light of Plaintiff's lack of opposition, the good cause demonstrated by Defendants (Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4)), and the Federal Rules' liberal policy in favor of granting leave to amend when justice so requires (Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2); Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1051 (9th Cir. 2003)), the Court hereby GRANTS

Defendants' motion. The Clerk's Office is hereby **ORDERED** to file the proposed Amended Answer to Second Amended Complaint, attached as Exhibit B to the Declaration of Roger N. Behle, Jr. [Doc. No. 28-4], separately as the operative Answer in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 10, 2008

BARBARA L. MAJOR

United States Magistrate Judge

12 COPY TO:

HONORABLE M. JAMES LORENZ U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

ALL COUNSEL

2 07cv2294-L (BLM)